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Author's response to reviews:

Editorial requests

Request 1

In the Netherlands the “Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act” (Wet Medisch Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek met Mensen) (WMO)) protects the interest of individuals that participate in medical research. Only medical research involving individuals subjected to the rules of conduct or acts, is liable for testing based on this law. Because our research is not within the scope of the WMO, no ethical approval was required.
http://www.st-ab.nl/wetten/0609_Wet_medisch-wetenschappelijk_onderzoek_met_mensen.htm

We inserted some new sentences in the text to explain why no ethical approval was acquired.

Request 2

We have asked a native speaker to assess the style of written English and to give suggestions for improvement.

Comments of Ms Heather Tan

Abstract

Remark 1

We included the number of semi-structured interviews in the methods section of the abstract

Remark 2

Background Paragraph 3 last 2 sentences: We inserted a gap between 8-12 and
the word and changed the grammatical construction as Ms Heather Tan suggested.

Remark 3

Indeed the number 15 is the reference number for the GARS scale. We recorded the number in square brackets as we did with all the superscripted reference numbers.

Remark 4

Thank you for noticing! In an earlier draft we added an appendix, but we decided in a later version not to use the appendix. I forgot to remove the referral.

Remark 5

We choose to refer to the literature because of the maximum amount of words for the manuscript. I have used you’re your suggestion to inform the reader more about the method. As for the second part of your remark: we thought the framework method appropriate for his study. We preferred individual interviews because the group is too heterogeneous for a focus group. The education level and the functional impairments (hearing, mobility) differed largely among the participants. Besides that the individual interviews had also a practical reason: in this way we could visit the participants at home.

Remark 5

Thank you for your correction. Indeed we did use subjective criteria to classify the importance of product and service attributes. Thanks to your comment we realise it is more correct not to use such subjective criteria. We therefore removed the table.

Remark 6 (Discretionary)

We are aware of the discussion of quantification or semi-quantification regarding qualitative research. We have the opinion that quantification of results from this kind of research does not do justice to qualitative research. Qualitative research is inductive and quantification gives the impression of deduction. To give an impression we choose for semi-quantitative presentation.

Remark 7

We adjusted the sentence as the reviewer requested.

Remark 8

We adjusted the sentence as the reviewer requested.
We substituted all reference numbers in superscript for numbers in square brackets. Because we changed the order of the text in some parts of the manuscript we renumbered a part of the reference numbers.

Remark 10
We expected the unpublished article to be published in the meantime. As this is not the case, we removed this reference and referred to other articles.

Remark 11
In the literature list we added a web link for the reports e.g. references 1 and 2.

Comments of Dr Danica Rotar Pavlic

Remark 1
In the Netherlands everyone is signed up at a GP practice. We approached patients who were signed up, not patients that attended the practice. In our sample some people visited the GP recently, but others did not for years. This is the reason we choose to use senior citizens in stead of senior attendees.

Remark 2
We have changed the text in the conclusion based on your remark. We would not have found those results if we used a quantitative method.

Remark 3
We do not completely understand the question but hope we understood your remark correctly. In qualitative research a preliminary classification after 3 to 4 interviews is a common procedure.